REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 are the only claims currently pending in the application. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are canceled. The foregoing separate sheets marked as "Listing of Claims" shows all the claims in the application, with an indication of the current status of each.

Applicant's undersigned counsel appreciates the Examiner's courtesy in holding a telephonic interview with the undersigned on May 21, 2007, and the Examiner's courtesy in holding follow-on telephonic interviews with the undersigned, concluding on June 6, 2007 with agreement that the Examiner, in response to the above amendment, will withdraw all rejections of claims 1 and 6 that are set forth in the Office Action of March 30, 2007.

Applicant respectfully submits the claim amendments and cancellations above are only in response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and are only for purposes of expediting the instant application. Applicant is not conceding in this application that any of the previously presented claims 1-10 are not patentable over Dahlquist, either considered alone or in combination with any prior art. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue previously presented claims 1-11, and any other claims drawn to any disclosed subject matter, in one or more continuation applications.

Applicant respectfully presents, for the record, that base claims 1 and 6, as previously presented and as currently amended, are patentable over Dahlquist for at least the reasons presented below.

Applicant's claim 1 invention generates, in response to a failure report identifying an equipment and textually describing the failure, a component troubleshooting list based on calculating, and combining, two different probabilities - the statistical failure probability of the hardware components, based on collected time-between-failure and time-to-repair statistics, and the case base failure probability, based on matching the textual description of the failure to the textual description in the records in the case-base database of previous failures. Applicant respectfully submits the claim 6 invention includes

6

system limitations corresponding to the above described method limitation of claim 1.

Dahlquist (now U.S. Patent No. 7,213,174) describes, to the extent it can be understood, a two stage diagnostic system, first classifying an event into a discrete class and then, after such classification, perform a "root cause" analysis. Dahlquist describes the "root cause" analysis as having, in its array of options, a "Bayesian network" and a case-based reasoning. *See* Dahlquist, at column 7, lines 21-36, and at column 8, lines 6-16.

Applicant respectfully submits that reading Dahlquist in its entirety a person of ordinary skill in the art would find nothing, either explicitly or under the doctrine of inherency, of calculating or generating a list of probabilities of which components have failed based on a combination of statistical reliability probability and case based failure probability.

Applicant further submits Dahlquist does not disclose anything, explicitly or under the doctrine of inherency, of its "Bayesian network," or of anything else having, embodying or practicing acts within the meaning of a statistical reliability probability database.

Applicant respectfully submits Dahlquist does not disclose anything, explicitly or under the doctrine of inherency, reasonably arguable as having, embodying or performing any kind of calculating, for each component of an equipment, the conditional probability of the component having a failed state given an equipment failure.

Applicant further submits Dahlquist discloses nothing, either explicitly or under the doctrine of inherency, of receiving a report or data having a text description of a failure and then matching the text description against the text description field of past equipment

Further, Applicant respectfully submits there is nothing within the Dahlquist reference that is a disclosure, either explicitly or under the doctrine of inherency, of generating a list of components likely to have a failed state by combining the component's probability of failure based on its statistical

reliability with a case-based reasoning probability of the component having a failed state.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1 and 6 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary, either in a telephonic or personal interview.

If an extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account 50-0510 (IBM-Yorktown).

Respectfully submitted,

Laurence E. Stein
Reg. No. 35,371

Whitham, Curtis, Christofferson & Cook, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, VA 20190
703-787-9400
703-787-7557 (fax)